

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

LINDA CURRY	:	CIVIL ACTION
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
	:	
ROYAL OAK ENTERPRISES, LLC,	:	11-5527
and THE BRINKMANN CORPORATION,	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 24th day of June, 2013, upon consideration of Defendant, Royal Oak Enterprises, LLC's *Daubert* Motion to Preclude the Testimony of Plaintiff's Expert, William S. Gilman, and Corresponding Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 27, filed December 31, 2012), Defendant The Brinkmann Corporation's *Daubert* Motion to Preclude the Testimony of Plaintiff's Expert, William S. Gilman, and Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 28, filed December 31, 2012), Plaintiff Linda Curry's Response in Opposition to Defendant Royal Oak Enterprises, LLC's *Daubert* Motion to Preclude the Testimony of Plaintiff's Expert, William S. Gilman, and Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 29, filed January 21, 2013), Plaintiff Linda Curry's Response in Opposition to Defendant The Brinkmann Corporation's *Daubert* Motion to Preclude the Testimony of Plaintiff's Expert, William S. Gilman, and Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 30, filed January 21, 2013), and the Joint Reply Brief in Support of Defendants, Royal Oak Enterprises, LLC and The Brinkman Corporation's *Daubert* Motions to Preclude the Testimony of Plaintiff's Expert, William S. Gilman, and Corresponding Motions for Summary Judgment (Document No. 31, filed January 30, 2013), for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum dated June 24, 2013, **IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. Defendant, Royal Oak Enterprises, LLC's *Daubert* Motion to Preclude the Testimony of Plaintiff's Expert, William S. Gilman, and Corresponding Motion for Summary

- Judgment (Document No. 27, filed December 31, 2012) are **GRANTED**; and,
2. Defendant The Brinkmann Corporation's *Daubert* Motion to Preclude the Testimony of Plaintiff's Expert, William S. Gilman, and Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 28, filed December 31, 2012) are **GRANTED**.

After review of all the motions papers, **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a *Daubert* hearing is not required or appropriate.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **JUDGMENT IS ENTERED** in **FAVOR** of defendants Royal Oak Enterprises, LLC and The Brinkmann Corporation, and **AGAINST** plaintiff Linda Curry.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall **MARK** the case **CLOSED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Hon. Jan E. DuBois
DuBOIS, JAN E., J.